

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Propel PEO, Inc., Propel HR, Inc., Lee C.)	
Yarborough, and Propel Holding,)	
Company, Inc.)	C.A. No. 6:19cv3546-HMH-KFM
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
Sean Eric Roach, Idea Catapult, LLC,)	
Angela Morris, and Arron Drye,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

The PARTIES filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198,

199 (4th Cir. 1983). The court must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald’s Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

ORDERED that defendant Roach’s motions to dismiss and to strike the complaint, document numbers 11 and 12, and defendant Drye’s motion to dismiss the complaint, document number 28, are denied as moot. It is further

ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is denied because Petitioner has failed to make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
March 17, 2020